



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,348	10/19/2000	Bruce Leroy Beukema	AUS9-2000-0631-US1	6902

35525 7590 07/05/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

SHIN, KYUNG H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/692,348	Applicant(s) BEUKEMA, BRUCE LEROY ET AL	
	Examiner Kyung H. Shin	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

PD

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims **1 - 25** are pending. Independent claims are **1, 10, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25**.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 3/29/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) under MacKenzie (US Patent No. 6,363,495: IBM) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of of **Moiin et al.** (US Patent No. 6,363,495).

3.1 In light of applicant's arguments that Williams in view of Frezza is a non-obvious combination and is not allowed, applicant is henceforth reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Furthermore, in response to applicant's arguments against the reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 103

4. **Claims 1 - 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Williams et al.** (US Patent No. 6,304,973) in view of **Frezza et al.** (US Patent No. 4,638,356) and further in view of **Moiin et al.** (US Patent No. 6,363,495).

Regarding Claims 1, 10, 13, 22, 24, 25, Williams discloses a method in a node for managing authorized attempts to access the node and a node, the method comprising:

- c) dropping the packet without a response to the source if the first key does not match the second key; (see Williams col. 22, lines 48-52: *Due to access violation (first key does not match second key) packet processing is stopped and no indication is returned to the source.*)
- d) storing information from the packet; (see Williams col. 17, lines 19-27: *During audit processing, information from the packet is stored.*)
- e) sending the information to a selected recipient in response to a selected event. (see Williams col. 5, lines 39-41; col. 17, lines 19-27: *All Network accesses are monitored and selected event are audited. During the audit process a selected recipient is sent information concerning the audited event.*)

Williams discloses a secure network environment controlling access to distributed network nodes. (see Williams col. 4, lines 28-33: *"... centralized administration of a layer 3 secure network ... distributed over the Internet ... provide a security device that prevents unauthorized third parties from gaining access to a host ... "*)

Network resource sharing techniques, which reduce operational costs due to a reduction in the total number of required network resources, are well known concepts for a network. A partitioned network enables network nodes to access shared network resources such as disk devices. Implementation of shared

resources within a distributed network is an obvious and efficient addition to any network.

Williams-Frezza does not specifically disclose a partitioned network, however, Williams-Frezza in view of Moiin discloses a secure partitioned network utilizing shared devices. The applicant's invention discloses a partitioned network that enables access to shared devices. The two systems disclose partitioned networks utilizing shared devices, therefore, both systems are equivalent.

- a) receiving a packet from a source, wherein the packet includes a first key, wherein the first key is a partition key associated with a particular partition of a multi-partitioned network having a plurality of partitions, and is used such that the node can determine which of the partitions of the multi-partitioned network can access the node; (see Frezza col. 6, lines 37-44; see Moiin col. 4, lines 15-19; col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 4; col. 13, lines 41-44; col. 13, lines 52-55: network nodes with a partitioned network, access to shared disk drives)
- b) determining whether the packet is from a partition authorized to access the node by determining whether the first key matches a second key for the node; (see Frezza col. 2, lines 40-51; see Moiin col. 4, lines 15-19; col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 4; col. 13, lines 41-44; col. 13, lines 52-55: network nodes within a partitioned network, access to shared disk drives)

Williams discloses receiving a packet from a source and verifying an authorized IP address (see Williams col. 22, lines 48-52), but does not explicitly teach an authentication process with a node key in packet. However, Frezza discloses in "Apparatus and Method for Restricting Access to a Communications Network", an authentication process that involves restricting access to a network with a node key, whereby the key is stored in the header of network packet (see Frezza col. 6, lines 37-44)

The key is used to determine whether it is valid to access a network resource (e.g. frame verifier, FV, codes), then if the items match authentication is successful. (see Frezza col. 2, lines 40-51)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams with a packet containing a key to determine whether it is valid as taught in Frezza, and to enable clustering techniques within a partitioned network as taught by Moiin. One would have been motivated to include a node key that is transmitted within the network packet by employing Frezza in order to have a strengthened authentication process by restricting access from unauthorized attempts on the network, and to employ Moiin in order to optimize configuration of a clustered partitioned network environment. (see Moiin col. 4, lines 40-43: "*... each node has more complete information regarding the potential member nodes of the new cluster, the resulting new cluster consistently has a relatively optimal configuration ...*")

Regarding Claims 2, 14, Williams discloses the method of claims 1 and 13, wherein the selected event is a request from the recipient for the information. (see Williams col. 5, lines 51-55; col. 18, lines 11-19: *Access violations, security related events, are reported to Network Security Controller (NSC) and are transmitted to audit process which is designated as a recipient*)

Regarding Claims 3, 15, Williams discloses the method of claims 1 and 13, wherein the selected event is an occurrence of a trap. (see Williams col. 17, lines 19-27: *The occurrence of a trap, which is designated an interrupt on Page 23 of specification, initiates audit process. Exception events are audited.*)

Regarding Claims 4, 16, Williams discloses the method of claims 1 and 13, wherein the selected event is a periodic event. (see Williams col. 17, lines 19-27: *Audit process tracks events occurring at a periodic interval such as an exception event*)

Regarding Claims 7, 19, Williams discloses the method of claims 1 and 13, wherein the node comprises at least one device private to the node and at least one device shared with at least one of the partitions of the multi-partition network. (see Williams col. 27, lines 38-47: *Alternate embodiment modifies NSC to retrieve access key for a node from a principal such as a subnet manager. Subnet manager is a SAN device used to configure and manage devices. The partition key is transmitted from the subnet*

manager to the manager software for inclusion in the authentication process; see Moin col. 4, lines 15-19; col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 4; col. 13, lines 41-44; col. 13, lines 52-55: network nodes with a partitioned network, access to shared disk drives)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams to enable clustering capabilities techniques within a partitioned network as taught by Moin. One would have been motivated to employ Moin in order to optimize the configuration of a clustered partitioned network environment. (see Moin col. 4, lines 40-43)

Regarding Claims 8, 11, 20, 23, Williams discloses the method of claims 1, 10, 13 and 22, wherein the information includes at least one of a source local identifier, a destination local identifier, the key value, a global identifier address. (see Williams col. 17, lines 19-27: “ ... *detailed information about the individual packets transmitted and received ...* “ *Key values information in network packets is audited. The subnet manager transmits an identifier (source local, destination local, global identifier address) or a key value to the manager software for inclusion in the authentication process.*)

Regarding Claims 9, 21, Williams discloses the method of claims 7 and 13, wherein the selected recipient is a subnet manager attached to a subnet that is responsible for configuring and managing switches, routers and channel adapters of the subnet. (see Williams col. 17, lines 19-27; col. 27, lines 38-47: *Alternate embodiment modifies NSC*

to send audit information concerning access violations to principal such as a subnet manager. The network manager transmits the required information to the subnet manager controlling the SAN.)

Regarding Claim 12, Williams discloses a data processing system comprising:

a) a bus system; a channel adapter unit connected to a system area network fabric; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; (see Williams col. 18, lines 44-50) and

b) a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to receive a packet from a source, wherein the packet includes a first key, wherein the first key is a partition key associated with a particular partition of a multi-partitioned network having a plurality of partitions, and is used such that the node can determine which of the partitions of the multi-partitioned network can access the network node; (same as 1.a); determine whether the first key matches a second key for the node (same as 1.b); drop the packet without a response to the source if the first key does not match the second key (same as 1.c); store information from the packet (same as 1.d); and send the information to a selected recipient in response to a selected event. (same as 1.e) These limitations encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 1.a - e, therefore these limitations are rejected for the same reason as the claim 1.a - e.

5. **Claims 5, 6, 17, 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Williams** in view of **Kekic et al.** (US Patent No. 6,664,978).

Williams discloses a secure network environment controlling access to network nodes distributed over the Internet. (see Williams col. 4, lines 28-33: "... *provide a centralized administration of a layer 3 secure network ... distributed over the Internet ... provide a security device that prevents unauthorized third parties from gaining access to a host ...*") Network Management techniques such as event monitoring, logging and event parameter update are obvious additions for management of network resources. Williams does not specifically disclose updating a counter value at the occurrence of a monitored event (i.e. key mismatches) occurring, however, Kekic discloses a network management system monitoring events and updating a counter value for a monitored parameter (i.e. key mismatches) and performing a specific action when a pre-determined threshold is surpassed. The applicant's invention discloses the update of a counter of key mismatch events and a pre-determined action being performed when a threshold value is surpassed. The two systems disclose monitoring event occurrences and performing pre-determined actions when a threshold is surpassed, therefore both systems are equivalent.

Regarding Claim 5, 17, Kekic discloses the method of claim 1 and 13 further comprising: incrementing a counter source if the first key does not match the second key. (see Kekic col. 27, lines 12-18; col. 69, lines 58-59: counter value is updated when event (i.e. key mismatch) is encountered)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2143

invention was made to modify Williams to include the ability to update a count of key mismatches as taught by Kekic. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to enhance Williams in order to perform event driven network management activities. (see Kekic col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 4: “... *standards-based network management solution for computer networks having a computer network management capability. The managed element server of this invention efficiently manages a constantly changing and growing heterogeneous computer network ...*”)

Regarding Claim 6, 18, Kekic discloses the method of claim 5 and 13, wherein the selected event occurs when the counter source exceeds a threshold value. (see Kekic col. 27, lines 12-18; col. 69, lines 58-59: counter value triggers a specific action when a threshold value is surpassed)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams to include the ability to update a key mismatches counter and perform a specific action when a threshold value is surpassed as taught by Kekic. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to enhance Williams in order to perform event driven network management activities. (see Kekic col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 4)

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung H. Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KHS

Kyung H Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS

June 22, 2005


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100